mitted in Classes 7 and 8, with a view to their final revision by the respective juries in New York. All works, selected by this preliminary jury, will be conveyed to and from New York at the expense of the Commission.

The Jury for Drawings and Illustrations will be composed of Otto H. Bacher, B. West Clinedinst, A. B. Frost, Howard Pyle, William T. Smedley, and W. A. Rogers.

The members of the Jury for Miniatures will include William J. Baer, Laura C. Hills, I. A. Josephi, and one other, not yet announced.

Etchings and Engravings will be selected by Frank French, Charles A. Platt, James D. Smillie and Henry Wolf. The three juries last mentioned will meet at the Fine Arts Building, New York, early in November.

The Jury for Sculpture will consist of Herbert Adams, Daniel C. French, Charles Graefly, Bela L. Pratt, Lorado Taft and J. Q. A. Ward.

In view of the great difficulty in moving large exhibits in this Class, it is proposed that the Jury for Sculpture shall visit some of the more prominent art centres where statuary of large size can be examined. To aid the jury in determining what places shall be visited, it is suggested that intending exhibitors not living in New York should send to the office of the Commission (Equitable Building, New York City) photographs of their work, if possible, from several points of view.

For the work of American artists residing abroad, two juries will be convened in Paris, probably about January 15. One of them will pass on all exhibits submitted in Classes 7 and 8 and the other on those in Class 9. The names will be announced later. The Director of Fine Arts will be an *ex-officio* member of every jury.

❋

THE PHŒBE HEARST COMPETITION FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

THE international competition for the Phœbe Hearst architectural plans for the University of California has been decided. At the outset ninety-eight architects from different countries submitted plans which were passed upon by a jury at Antwerp last year. Twenty-one designs were selected as being eligible for the subsequent trial. Finally the number was reduced to eleven, and the architects of these were requested to prepare their plans in detail and for that purpose visited San Francisco. The final award has just been made. M. Benard heads the list and wins the first prize of $10,000. The remaining prize-winners are Americans. Howells, Stokes & Hornbostel, of New York, won the second prize of $4,000; Despardelles & Stephen Codman, of Boston, the third of $3,000; Howard & Cauldwell, of New York, the fourth of $2,000, and Lord, Hewlett & Hull, of New York, the fifth of $1,000. All the prize-winners are graduates of the Ecole des Beaux Arts.

M. Benard was born at Goderville, France, in 1844. He held the Grand Prix de Rome and is identified with some of the greatest architectural works in France. His plans involve the removal of every building on the University grounds and the virtual creation of a new city. What seems to have favorably impressed the jury in his design is that he has carefully preserved the natural advantages of the site, adapting his scheme even to the contour of the ground, whereas some of the plans involved the serious extra cost of considerable excavation. Even the oak trees and the streams of water have been carefully considered and the erection of the buildings will not disturb any. Provision is made for every department, including a theatre and a gymnasium. The style is said to be a freely modern adaptation of Roman Ionic.

Opening from University avenue is a great court which the architect has called, rather unfortunately, Fine Arts Square. Around this are grouped some of the educational buildings proper. Southward are two theatres, while east of the square, at the end of an avenue upon which face the buildings dedicated to Ancient and Modern History and English, the Library and the Department of Jurisprudence, is the Athletic Field, with an athletic Hall and Gymnasium. North and east of the athletic building is the Military Department, and to the west the various clubhouses.

On the rising ground towards Grizzly Peak

stands a group of buildings devoted to the Departments of Zoology, Botany and Kindred Sciences. A museum is also included and the Peak is crowned with an Observatory. Upon the hillside are placed the dormitories, and lower down in the park, where the hothouses now stand, the residences of members of the Faculty. At the other extremity of the grounds is the Infirmary.

The great feature of M. Benard's plan was the general plan of the buildings, more especially of the grand court; and it is said that this decided the jury in his favor.

In the designs of Messrs. Howells, Stokes & Hornbostel, prominence is given to the dormitory features, somewhat to the prejudice, it seemed to the jury, of the Educational Departments. The Athletic arrangements are very similar to those of M. Benard, except that the grounds have been given the form of an amphitheatre. The winners of the third prize, Messrs. Despardelles & Codman, extended their plans beyond the limits of the University grounds, and cut the whole scheme in two by a wide public boulevard running from the end of University avenue to Telegraph avenue.

❋

PNEUMATIC POWER IN STONE-CARVING

It is said that there are over forty quarries in Vermont alone in which the stone-carver applies pneumatic power to his chisel instead of the blows of a mallet. While the contrivance is used for the carving of marble and granite in the quarries almost universally, a prejudice seems to have existed against using it for exactly the same class of work when executed on the building itself. There seems a great inconsistency in this. Either the method can produce as artistic results as the mallet or it cannot. If it can, why need the architect hesitate to use it on a building? If it cannot, he is conniving at inartistic work by permitting it to be done in the comparative privacy of the quarry.

The contrivance is a very simple one. A small engine and pump supply air at a pressure of fifty pounds to the square inch. This is conveyed through a rubber tube to a steel cylinder, about the size of a rifle barrel and a foot long, which the carver holds in the right hand. The chisel, held in the other hand, fits loosely into a socket in the end of the cylinder. Within the barrel of the latter is a solid piece of steel with hardened end, in shape somewhat like a rifle bullet. Under the throbbing pressure of the air this bounds against the end of the chisel, rebounds and bounds again, with a rapidity of from four to five thousand blows a minute, the actual velocity being regulated by a valve in the tube close to the operator's hand. It needs several days of use to grow accustomed to the terrible jar which the instrument gives to the arms. The feeling is very like that produced by an electric battery. But soon the operator ceases to be troubled by the sensation and finds, it is asserted, the process less fatiguing and pleasanter than the wielding of the mallet. If this be true, and it probably is, or the labor union would have opposed the contrivance, there is great gain for the craftsman. The next point is how it affects the artistic quality of the work.

At first sight, anything which increases the facility of the operator should leave the craftsman freer to play with his design, rendering it, if he is capable, more artistic; for there is less interference between what he wishes to do and the doing of it. And, certainly, its increase of facility is undeniable. The chisel cuts its way into the marble as if it were a carrot, passes with a free sweep through the channels in the ornament or buries itself in the deep hollows, scooping them out as cleanly and expeditiously as the dentist's drill clears the cavity of a tooth. This process, also, is said to be less damaging to the surface of the marble. A chisel struck with a mallet is likely to bruise the surface. The marble in the immediate neighborhood of the blow becomes whiter; its surface is slightly pulverized, and in the recessed parts this tends to lessen the shadow effects. There is a mistaken notion that, while the new process is useful for the rougher and bolder effects, it entirely fails in the delicate portions. Experience proves the direct opposite. From the practical, or, if you like, commercial standpoint, the more minute and dainty the design, the more efficient is the pneumatic hammer. For roughing out the